



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PARNELL AS A LEADER.

WHEN by arms and bribes England destroyed the domestic Parliament of Ireland and passed the Act of Legislative Union in 1800, that self-betrayed body did not represent the people of Ireland. It was not a National Parliament. Three-fourths of the people were disqualified by religious proscription from sitting in it. For only seven years prior to its self-betrayal this majority had enjoyed a nominal right to vote for members of it, but the privilege was encumbered with conditions which practically continued their disfranchisement. They remained in this state until 1829. The franchise, however, was so modified and the masses of the people were so degraded by the effects of the penal laws and the machinery of landlordism, that they continued to be without a National representation at Westminster, as they had been without one when the Irish Parliament sat in Dublin. Those of them who were entitled to vote were compelled to elect either their landlords or their landlords' nominees, or to suffer eviction, exile, or death, as the penalty of their insubordination.

As late as 1853, when Mr. Gladstone introduced the Irish income tax, 72 out of the 105 members for Ireland, more than two-thirds of the whole, voted against it. He paid no more attention to their opposition than he would have done had they been sitting in the moon. He knew they did not represent the people, whose votes they procured for the most part by intimidation. When, at a later period, a minority of the members for Ireland proposed Home Rule, he replied, in substance, "You do not speak for Ireland. It will be time enough to consider Home Rule when the people of Ireland ask for it through a majority of the Irish members."

In 1873 a Home Rule conference was held in Dublin. The requisition convening it was read by none other than Mr. King-

Harman, who, having obtained a seat in the House of Commons upon that platform, abandoned his constituents, and is now the Tory Parliamentary Under-Secretary for Ireland, urging coercion instead of Home Rule. The requisition recited that "We feel bound to express our conviction that it is necessary to the peace and prosperity of Ireland and would be conducive to the strength and stability of the United Kingdom, that the right of domestic legislation on all Irish affairs should be restored to our country." Upon that fundamental declaration about 60 Home Rulers of varying degrees of earnestness or insincerity, were elected to Parliament. They accomplished nothing. A few were brilliant speakers and occasionally enlivened a debate without changing a vote. A greater number were place-hunters. Some were landlords whose residence in London suited their convenience and gratified their tastes. Ireland was still without a genuine National representation.

In 1874 the Home Rule League held a council in Dublin to select a candidate for a vacancy in Dublin County. Mr. Parnell was agreed upon. When he rose to speak he broke down. When the votes were counted he was beaten. But the group of stalwart patriots who, in those twilight hours, were watching the dawn of Ireland's legislative independence, perceived that the young man who had failed on the rostrum and lost at the hustings was needed in the Home Rule League, and the next year a seat was found for him. When he entered Parliament in 1875 he was not quite thirty years of age. Irish by birth, his education had been wholly English. He had no political training, except such as comes by intuition from family traditions; two of his ancestors had filled seats for Irish constituencies with ability and honor. His habits and prejudices were necessarily aristocratic. His associates in Parliament found him seclusive. For two years he applied himself with rigor to mastering the rules of the House and to investigating public questions. He rarely spoke in the House or publicly out of it. In private he was courteous and taciturn. At the end of those two years it was found that, although men of more impetuous disposition and more showy gifts were much better known in the United Kingdom, Charles Stewart Parnell was the strongest man to lead the Home Rule party in Parliament. This result was due first to his skill in procedure. How he acquired it he doubtless divulged to one of his colleagues

of a later day. "How shall I learn the rules of the House?" was the question put to him. "By breaking them," was the quiet reply.

The choice of Mr. Parnell as leader was due, secondly, to the intellectual qualities which had been slowly disclosed by his conduct. These were constructiveness, tenacity, courage, patience, and reserve. He had resolutely carried out an aggressive mode of action. It is now known as obstruction. He saw, what every patriot had seen from the beginning of Ireland's representation at Westminster, that no attention would be paid by that body to the interests of Ireland, except under compulsion. Unlike any of his predecessors in the leadership, he had the boldness and the *finesse* to clog the wheels of the Parliamentary coach until drivers and passengers thrust their heads together to ask what was the matter, and how the obstacle could be removed. To the principle of obstruction he added that of incidental co-operation. Standing aloof from both English parties, he gave to each substantial support on deserving proposals as a means of winning reciprocal consideration. It is not strange that he worked hard for a bill which appealed to the intense humanity of his nature, that to abolish flogging in the army.

In 1879 the time seemed to have come for the organization of a true National party. Many of the nominal Home Rulers had gone to their reward—some to office, some to oblivion. Isaac Butt, the most impressive figure in the party, and its first leader, had passed to the grave, leaving a fame which soon perished except among his own people. The first man at the bar of Ireland, with few superiors at the bar of England, with none in the House of Commons, a man of prodigious attainments, remarkable eloquence, and varied personal charms, he had fully demonstrated that oratory could not conquer the English Parliament for Ireland, nor superb arguments, enrapturing her oppressors, loose a solitary link of her lengthened chain. It was manifest that a new party, a new leader, a different mode of attack, concerted action, discipline, and specific objects, were indispensable, if Home Rule should cease to be a dream. Meanwhile famine was again creeping along the horizon like a mist coming stealthily in from sea. The Gladstone land-laws had proven futile under landlord ingenuity and tenant helplessness. To rescue the people from the danger of starvation was as necessary as to found a new party. With

instinctive sagacity, Mr. Parnell believed the second was the shortest road to the first.

The new party was organized in Dublin in the autumn of 1879. Mr. Parnell was elected President. Mr. Davitt, its co-founder, was one of its Secretaries. To give it the most solid of foundations, it was planted squarely on the land. Its name was the Land League, and its objects were defined to be to secure a reduction of rack-rents and to facilitate the obtaining of the ownership of the soil by the occupiers. It was clear that money would be needed to put the new movement in operation, and a resolution was passed requesting Mr. Parnell to visit America to secure funds. Mr. John Dillon accompanied him.

Although not explicitly formulated, it was perfectly understood on both sides of the Atlantic by the Irish race that the method of the new party was to be strictly constitutional ; that the means to be employed were to be essentially moral. The people were to be aroused, organized, educated, so that when the next general election arrived only genuine Nationalists should be sent to Parliament.

I happened to be one of a committee to lay out the route for Mr. Parnell in a portion of the United States. Had I not, in the fulfillment of the task, enjoyed unusual and close opportunities for studying Mr. Parnell, I should have felt compelled to decline the request of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* for an estimate of his abilities and career as a leader. I comply with it with diffidence, even possessing this personal knowledge ; whatever value my judgment may have is largely founded upon my observation of him in those days when, surrounded by men not selected by himself, and all of them total strangers, beset by perplexities and novelties, wearied with long journeys, harassed by excessive kindness, he must have appeared in his simplest manner and generally at his worst.

I was impressed first by his delicacy and refinement. The one was constitutional ; the other, if a grace, was so harmonious with his nature that it seemed a part of it ; not a garment upon his character, but inherent in it. His habitual modesty was matched by an acuteness of perception and a thoroughness of comprehension which speedily changed hesitation and uncertainty into clearness and confidence. When he first spoke in my hearing in public his voice was unsteady, his address without evidence of previous men-

tal plan, his ideas, each sharp and substantive, without cohesiveness, his feeling toward his audience timid and ineffectual. He stood erect as a young pine, his handsome face winning admiration and his pose and figure arousing trust; but his defective articulation, his feeble monotone, and excessive shyness proved seriously disappointing to great gatherings eager to have another O'Connell bring their hearts into their mouths and fill the air with their shouts of slumbering passion and reawakened hope.

In a few weeks all this was changed. The man who had faltered at Indianapolis was the calm, cold, clear, convincing speaker at Chicago. Twenty thousand filled the Exposition to see and hear him, and although only an O'Connell could have been heard by such a multitude in such an area, Parnell was heard distinctly by a great portion of it. Every sentence he uttered was clear-cut, incisive, apt, and telling; his speech, as a whole, while not ostentatious, was one of a series which made a profound impression upon the American people. I never heard any human being, whether uncouth or cultivated, doubt his sincerity, or hesitate, after seeing and hearing, to trust and follow him.

But the mist that had been creeping up from the sea had become a deadly cloud. Vague and horrible rumors were no longer to be discredited. Three years of declining harvests, especially of the potato crop, which is the life of the people, had culminated in their ruin. No matter whether the farms produced the rents, the rents had been ruthlessly exacted. Thousands were suffering pangs of hunger, and there was every reason to fear that if aid were not sent forthwith, the gigantic tragedy of '47 would be repeated. There was plenty of food in Ireland; exports of it continued to go out of every harbor. But it was not the people's, although their labor had produced it. It was the landlords'; and although the producers perished like dogs around them, their rents must be collected in foreign markets. Have Americans ever realized that the word *famine*, as applied in Ireland, is an untruth? Its popular meaning is deficiency of the yield of food, causing hunger and death. But there has never been such a deficiency in Ireland. When a million and a half died of actual starvation in 1847, enough food for more than twice the entire population was exported. When A. T. Stewart's ship entered Queenstown bay with food, she passed three English ships carrying food out. Famine in Ireland meant in 1847, and meant in

1880, that, although the soil and the people together had produced adequate harvests, all went to the landlords as rent ; while the failure of the potato crop left the people in danger of death, if money were not furnished to them to buy back from the landlords the other foods produced by Irish labor out of Irish earth.

Parnell had come to this country glowing with noble aspirations as the chosen leader of a new and sanguine movement for the recovery of the parliament of a nation. What visions must have filled his imagination ! Like a man on a mountain top beholding the land of his birth regenerated, he saw her fair fields in possession of her own sons—seas of gold as the autumn sun shone upon their ripening crops. He beheld dingy villages expanding into smoke-crowned manufacturing towns. He saw the great rivers turning busy wheels, and bearing Irish commerce down to the sea. Sitting in the ancient Parliament House in Dublin he beheld the legislature of his nation, its members freely chosen by all the citizens, without distinction of creed or class, the old feuds forgotten, the old proscriptions dead, the old hates, fomented by England to postpone this day of happiness, completely past ; a tranquil, virtuous, active people, progressing in common love and complete harmony. The apostle of this vision had been sent to the exiled of his race in a great free land, and the commission which he bore to them was to make known the resolution of their countrymen at home to make this vision fact. All at once the picture faded. He saw only the dismal hovel, the smoldering hearth, the rags, the wan faces, the fever pallets, the evictor, the jails and poorhouses, the rotting bodies in the ditches, the ships going out of the coves with the harvests, the husbandmen and their families dying of hunger. It was a change to break a weak man's heart. The landlords—for I will not blaspheme by saying it was “the will of God”—had altered his commission by substituting famine for national regeneration.

Proud, sensitive, aristocratic, he told the story of the now confessed danger with simple pathos. He spoke of political hopes and party plans with subdued spirit. He asked money, not to put a party on its feet, but to save a people from extermination. Nor did he ask it in a lordly way. He was no longer the leader of a great political movement ; he was the brother and servant of the suffering Irish peasant. With grave countenance and simple modesty he passed his own hat among the graver

throng; and from many a swarthy face, from out blazing and furious eyes in which flashed the fire of frenzied memory, dropped tears with tribute.

The most conservative of British political economists define agricultural rent as the surplus due the landlord after the tiller has had out of the proceeds of his labor upon the soil a living for himself and his family. When it was manifest that if the landlords did not make a reduction of rents in the autumn of 1879, on account of the shrinkage in crops and the loss of two-thirds of the potato-yield, famine would ensue, the government stated, through a mouth-piece in Parliament, that it had no intention of bringing in a bill for the reduction of rents. The humanity of the world took up the duty the government of Ireland rejected. The London *Times*, with characteristic truthfulness, declared in the same autumn "food has been and is everywhere cheap and plentiful." At the same time nearly 60,000 persons were receiving support in the poorhouses, against 50,000, the highest number in the famine period of '47, while the out-door relief had broken completely down. Charity saved at least 500,000 people from death by starvation. The money was sent from Bombay, Madras, Bengal, South Africa, the United States, Canada, South America, the Australias, and Fiji; from the four continents; and every dollar of the total, which amounted to over \$4,000,000, was paid to Irish landlords in violation of the fundamental principle of the conservative British school. The Irish landlord has been the pet of Providence.

Indeed, he may be truly described as the pet of the Irish race, as well as of Providence and the world. The land in Ireland has not produced for forty years the rents exacted of the tenants. Every year their kin in America and the British colonies have sent remittances to make up the balance. Is it strange that English Radicals like William Saunders, and other honest and practical economists, should have opposed the supplementary bonus of millions of pounds to these fortunate men out of the British treasury,—that is, out of the working people of the United Kingdom,—as proposed in Mr. Gladstone's abandoned land bill? Is it not a more enlightened policy on the part of the Irish in America, who ought to keep in this country the money earned here, to contribute toward the abolition of this system of landlordism rather than to continue to pay these rents?

The general election of 1880 caught Mr. Parnell unprepared. Famine was in possession of the country, and the funds which would have been devoted to legitimate political expenses went to the landlords. The result was that sixty-eight men were returned as Home Rulers ; but he had not selected all of them, and he entertained doubts of many. There were even doubts whether Mr. Parnell would be confirmed in the leadership. When the Home Rulers met in London to determine the question, only forty-one were present ; twenty-three voted for Mr. Parnell. From that hour there was no rivalry. The disloyal, the self-seeking, the worthless, fell out or were dismissed. The fight of those bitter and tormented years in Parliament, the struggle of the people against landlordism on the one hand and against the government on the other, after the passage of the Gladstone Coercion Act,—the re-imprisonment of Mr. Davitt, the arrest and imprisonment of Mr. Parnell and many of his colleagues,—all this cannot be touched within the compass of this paper. Twelve hundred citizens, nearly all men of the highest integrity, were kept in jail without trial, denied bail, subjected to plank beds, prison diet and all the indignities of their situation, for no other offense than constitutional agitation.

Blameless women were dragged into courts and thrust into jails under an obsolete statute designed for the restraint of the dissolute ; their offense was the charity they extended to the victims of landlordism. The history of Ireland in 1881, and up to 1884, is as foul a page as will be found in the annals of disgrace which England has written for herself in more volumes than she has statutes.

Unlike the prisoners of old Rome who, weakened by agony, returned under torture to the gods of the empire, Ireland grew stronger and more resolute under Mr. Gladstone's coercion law. Her press was gagged ; her platforms were silent ; her prisons were filled ; her streets were patrolled by soldiery ; her courts were polluted by the perjurer, and her bench, always defiled more or less, became an offense to civilization. Yet the heart of a nation continued to throb with energy and fervor ; and perhaps it was worth those years of sorrow and exasperation that the great statesman who had bound and gagged Ireland should live to learn from the lips of his captive the lesson of statesmanship, humanity, and

reparation which he is now teaching, with no uncertain result, to the thinking masses of England, Scotland, and Wales.

With recovered freedom, Mr. Parnell set to work organizing Ireland for the general election of 1884. All the resources which Liberals and Conservatives could throw into Ireland against him, he had to contend with. Against unlimited wealth he had only the voluntary tribute of his race. Against intimidation, such as was never known even before the passage of the ballot act, he had to rely only on the confidence of the constituencies. The result was that contesting eighty-nine seats,—the others were hopeless,—he won 85 out of 103. To this total was added one seat in England, the Scotland division of Liverpool carried by Mr. T. P. O'Connor. When he returned to Parliament with this formidable and compact body, both English parties acknowledged that a new era had set in in British politics. Home Rule became the irrepressible question, and Charles Stewart Parnell was the second personage in Parliament. In the management of his augmented power, he developed striking faculties as a debater. His minute knowledge of the operation of the land laws, his familiarity with the changes which were constantly occurring on the face of the country, his expertness in the rules, his absolute indifference to English statesmen and his independence of English parties, his silent scorn of revilement, his soft answers to ignorance and foolishness, his defiance of privileged ruffianism, his fidelity to his own men in small things, and to his country in everything, has enabled him to hold in the political world a position without precedent or parallel. Steadfast in his convictions, stringent in his adherence to constitutional methods, and scrupulous about the morality of the means exclusively employed by him in their promotion, he has been consistent in his career from the day he made his first speech in Dublin down to this hour. His greatest triumph thus far has been that he was able to confront Mr. Gladstone with his old declaration, that it would be time enough to take up the question of Home Rule when Ireland demanded Home Rule through the mouths of a majority of her representatives.

The general election of 1886 reaffirmed the confidence of his country in him and his colleagues. He had pledged himself "to remain independent of all English parties." In the fulfillment of that pledge, he antagonized first one and then the other with skill so consummate that their union against Ireland was rent in twain.

He has now for his ally the progressive democratic element of the British people, under the leadership of the most illustrious statesman England has ever produced. Astute, when his foes thought him only inert, and when friends may have deemed him excessively cautious, Mr. Parnell has shown extraordinary sagacity in refusing to offer a Home Rule bill at any time. Events have demonstrated that any bill submitted by him which would have satisfied the least expectant of the Irish people would have been rejected by a combination of the English parties as often as it might have been proposed. It was necessary that the Home Rule measure should be fathered by one of the British parties. Mr. Parnell fought both, until one coquetted with the subject just enough to hasten its earnest assumption by the other ; and although the passage of the bill has been delayed by demagogues, and a coercion bill is put on passage in its place, the majority of the voters of the United Kingdom have cast their ballots for Ireland's liberty. It is fairly probable that another general election will send up to Westminster a majority of representatives instructed for Home Rule.

It is not in Parliament only that the evidences of Mr. Parnell's influence as a leader must be sought. If the evidences are to be found only there, be they ever so persuasive, they would not be sufficient. We must seek them in the temper and progress of the people in Ireland, in their temper as showing increased self-control, in their progress as seen in their eagerness for education, and the improvement of their social condition so far as that is within their power.

Wolfe Tone's crude attempt at insurrection toward the close of the last century, Emmet's effort in the beginning of this, the resolve of Young Ireland in '48 to try the sword once more, the Fenian outbreak—not altogether a failure, according to Mr. Gladstone himself—were the spasms of an exasperated people unable to realize that the practically unlimited military strength of an empire would be used to crush them without difficulty and without remorse. Parnell has made the brain of Ireland defy England by resisting the old impulse to throw herself on English bayonets. The conflicts of the world are no longer carried on by war alone. The little and the weak have new means of contesting with the mighty and the brutal. Minds have come to count for more than artillery, and passive resistance Parnell has demonstrated

to be more dangerous than unequally matched battalions. The self-control of the nation finds a corresponding development in the conduct of the people as individuals.

“The man who commits a crime is an enemy of his country,” was spoken by O’Connell and reiterated by Davitt. Irish crime is a subject upon which general misinformation prevails in this country, and general misrepresentation in Great Britain. A man who pays no special attention to statistics may be pardoned for supposing that the chronic condition of Ireland is a criminal one, for that belief has been forced upon him by the persistent falsehood of the English press. Alleged crime has been made the excuse for a hundred and more repressive legislative acts since the Act of Legislative Union. Yet those unimpassioned witnesses—the Blue Books—show that in proportion to population there is always less crime in Ireland than in either of the other divisions of the United Kingdom; that what crime there is has a direct relation to the degree of starvation prevailing and the number of regiments quartered upon the people. During periods and in districts of fair crops, crime in Ireland has been almost unknown. During periods of deficient crops, when the landlord oppression is proportionately increased, and in the large centres where the idle and vicious soldiery predominate, crime reaches its Irish maximum. But that maximum is moderate compared with the crime always prevalent in England and Scotland.

In Ireland, in 1877, the indictable offenses committed were in the ratio of 11.8 in 10,000 of the population. As partial famine gradually extended over the country, the percentage rose to 13 in 1878, to 15.1 in 1879, and to 16 in 1880. “The last year when there was a similar increase,” reads the Blue Book,* “to that of 1879 was 1862. . . . The pressure was greater than in 1862, and more nearly approached, in some districts, the effect of the famine of 1847. The figures indicate the effect of the pressure of distress in producing crime.” And the remedy in 1847, in 1862, and in 1881 was coercion!

Strange as it may appear, although there was no famine in England or Scotland in 1880, the Irish number of more serious offenses was only 743 greater than the proportional number for

* Criminal and Judicial Statistics, 1881.

England, and was 771 less than the corresponding proportion for Scotland. It should be added that in offenses against morality,—which is the true test of the national character of a people,—the proportional figures were for Ireland, 119 ; for England, 175 ; for Scotland, 238. For perjury,—we have heard about the impossibility of getting convictions in Irish courts,—Ireland, 8 ; England, 27 ; Scotland, 36, in the same proportions of population. Offenses against property with violence, Ireland, 584 ; proportionally for England, 1,315 ; for Scotland, 3,310. Offenses against property without violence, Ireland, 557 ; England, 1,825 ; Scotland, 1,467. Yet we are told that the Irish are a criminal people ! A suggestive group of figures may be taken from the same volume and for the same year in Ireland, 1880.*

	—Proportional numbers.—		
	Irish.	English.	Scotch.
Assaults on women and children.....	469	495	495
Theft and embezzlement.....	6,083	11,982	18,285
Bastardy.....	2	1,017	1,015

It is of record that 90 per cent. of the persons proceeded against that year of misery in Ireland were of previous good character, while the known thieves were only one-fifth as many proportionately in population as those of England and Wales.

But let us compare the Ireland of 1880 with Parnell's Ireland in 1885—the latest accessible returns. His constant admonition to the people was to avoid violations of the law. The total of all crime, indictable and non-indictable, in 1880, amounted to 23.4 in 10,000 of the population. In 1885 the figure was 14.5.

The government headquarters, military and civil, are in Dublin. Nearly one-third of the indictable offenses committed in Ireland are within the Dublin district, which contains only one-sixteenth of the population of the country. Yet in 1880 the crime of Dublin was less proportionally than the crime of Manchester.

Another highly significant fact in the criminal statistics of the countries is the proportion of convicts for felonies to all offenders. In the year 1881, when the showing would have been exceptionally bad for Ireland, the proportional figures are, for Ireland, 7.3 per cent. ; for England, 23.3 per cent.

* See p. 18, *ibid.*

The decline of crime of all kinds in Parnell's Ireland is most comprehensively shown by this table :

	Committed.	Convicted.
1881.....	5,311	2,698
1882.....	4,301	2,255
1883.....	3,025	1,740
1884.....	2,925	1,546
1885.....	2,850	1,573

It is safe to assume that a National spirit which, in spite of political and social irritation, exhibits increasing self-control year by year, will be found year by year making greater progress in education. During the period of Parnell's leadership, the school enrollment has annually increased, notwithstanding that the landlord system continues annually to diminish the population by emigration practically compulsory. The rate of increase of school enrollment found in decades from 1850 to 1880 is doubled between 1880 and 1885. In the table issued by the United States Bureau of Education in 1882 our own country led the world, with Ireland abreast, in the proportion of elementary school enrollment to population. I am confident that the figures for the last year will show Ireland ahead even of the United States. Germany is third, England and Wales fourth, and then follow Switzerland, etc. What an answer to the epithet of "ignorant" upon the Irish people! Ignorant indeed they were, made so by the penal code which reduced more than half of them to compulsory illiteracy. In 1841 53 per cent. of the population could neither read nor write. It might well be supposed that a country without free and acceptable elementary schools was a country without taxation. But from 1832 to 1852 the aggregate of taxes which England extorted from Ireland was \$443,335,875, and the total appropriated out of that in the same period for elementary education was \$6,996,065. Was the reproach of ignorance upon the Irish people just?

It was a happy omen that the first bill which Mr. Parnell's obstruction tactics forced through Parliament was an intermediate Education Act for Ireland. The Nationalists have made every year a stubborn and sagacious fight to secure larger appropriations for education purposes, and the world is witness that, as crime has diminished and school enrollment increased, the Home Rule feeling has grown throughout the country. While the penal

code buried the entire body of Roman Catholics in a political tomb, the sacred fire of liberty was fed by the genius of Irish Protestants and the valor of Presbyterian Republicans. To-day, under Protestant Parnell, all Ireland, with the exception of inveterate Orangeism, demands Home Rule. Even in Trinity College, which before the Union was the cradle of Irish patriots, and exclusively Protestant, and which, since the Union, sectarianism palsied as a national force, has at length organized a Home Rule club that includes many of the most distinguished names in Irish science and letters.

A splendid proof of Mr. Parnell's fitness to be a National leader is seen in the talents of the men he has chosen for colleagues. Had Grattan been free from jealousy of Flood, he might have retained on their country's side a man his equal in many gifts. O'Connell's intolerance of men of ability who differed from him on secondary matters is a stain upon his reputation. From the beginning of Parnell's career he has sought for associates the ablest and noblest of his countrymen without conjecturing how he might suffer by contrast. When only an indifferent speaker himself, he solicited the association of the late A. M. Sullivan. By no means an indifferent speaker now, he keeps in the front of his ranks orators far exceeding him in brilliancy of figure and polish of period—Sexton and John E. Redmond. Without distinction in literature, he counts among his supporters Justin McCarthy and Thomas Power O'Connor. Not an expert with the polemic pen, he chooses for colleagues Edmund Dwyer Gray, T. D. Sullivan, and William O'Brien. A small-minded man might have hesitated before trusting his own fame against the fascination that a personality like John Dillon's exercises over an emotional people. The heir of that spurious superiority of class over manhood, he has held to be indispensable men drawn from commerce and manufactures,—Biggar, and Lane, and William Murphy. Never was his wisdom in general more emphatically approved by experience, or his judgment of individuals shown to be sounder by trial, than in his choice of Patrick Egan for treasurer of the Land League. In what other country could a great political movement have continued after its officers were imprisoned as the National movement went on in Ireland, with only Patrick Egan free and he a voluntary exile in France? The government assumed that if the engineers were jailed the engine would stop

running. To their amazement it went on with undiminished power and steady direction; and when Patrick Egan begged release from his country's service to return to the service of his family, Mr. Parnell's prudence was displayed once more in naming as his successor the Quaker business man, Alfred Webb.

The fashion of finding members of Parliament only among the rich or the titled he set aside with unconscious disdain. One of the most brilliant of living parliamentarians Mr. Parnell transferred from the modest duties of his own private secretary to a seat in the House—T. M. Healy. He went into the profession of medicine, for men like Dr. Kenny, Dr. Tanner, and Dr. Fox; from the student's desk, the bar, the counting room, the farm, the manufactory, he has taken Harrington, Arthur and John O'Connor, Deasy, Tuite, Maurice Healy, Mathew Harris, Clancy, Commins, Chance, O'Doherty, Blake, William Redmond, Hooper, and many more whose names are less known to us on this side of the water.

Ten years ago the suggestion would have been scoffed at that men hidden, most of them in Irish villages, should ever contend for intellectual supremacy with the hereditary wealth and culture of the United Kingdom. Most of them are young, and their contemporaries of corresponding age in the House, born in luxury, reared in leisure and recreation, or equipped for careers in great universities, make their presence known in the Imperial Legislature by after-dinner folly, or by preserving a more respectable silence. In no other age, in no other Legislature, has been seen a parallel for the now familiar spectacle of the most eminent in both the great English parties finding in these Irish youth their peers in forensic ability, in knowledge of subject matter, in tactics of discussion, in endurance and in determination. In the turbulent days, when Conservatives and Liberals were one against Parnell and Ireland, it made little difference whether Salisbury or Gladstone were premier. The entire combined array of their first-class men were continually routed by the ingenuity and skill of the Irish patriot party; and their joint invention of cloture was confession that they were compelled to resort to brute force to overcome a numerically insignificant body, who overmatched, in mental power, their consolidated strength. Mr. Parnell's lofty appreciation of his leadership as a national trust is seen in his conduct toward Mr. Davitt. That heroic political felon is held

very tenderly in the heart of his country. He has shared with Mr. Parnell the direction of the movement out of which the Parliamentary party has grown—the land movement; but he has declined to enter Parliament, and he has come to hold, on the land question, views not identical with Mr. Parnell's. Their mutual respect, and the perfect confidence each feels in the other, which malevolence or shallowness has not been able to disturb, is not only proof of the manly fibre in both, but a testimony to the political integrity of the nation and the generation which has given them birth.

Races have an evolution more appreciable than that of species. The struggle for existence finds in the Irish race a palpable example. Moral purity and physical strength have carried it through ages of resistance, under which an immoral or feeble people would have disappeared. The race development shows its highest type in the character of Parnell. The intellectual traits which control him are those made inevitable by a persistent race struggle against superior physical odds. Composure, patience and wariness have succeeded impetuosity, vain daring, and wasted valor. At the same time there is not a noble trait of the past of his people which is not preserved in him. Whoever saw his bared head accepting alms for his suffering country saw a man who would seize the sword with joy, were the sword the weapon to conquer his country's freedom. Nor has her long martyrdom failed to affect his blood. The famines, the massacres, the coercions, the exile of millions burning with a sense of wrong which can expire only with life, has made it impossible that all Irishmen shall possess his calmness. He will not depart a hair's breadth from the constitutional methods to which he is pledged. But as sublimely as ever martyr stood at the stake has he remained silent when England has demanded that he shall denounce her victims, whose extreme views are the natural result of her centuries of brutal oppression.

That man is greatest who most sagaciously applies available means to desired ends. Parnell may not be a Napoleon, but he will never lead an army to Moscow in midwinter. He stands to-day the representative of a people resolved to recover National independence. He has nearly succeeded. The sympathy and admiration of all generous men, and the love of his race, surround and sustain him.

ALEXANDER SULLIVAN.